



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Apostolic Fathers. Of *μή* and its compounds there are 139 examples, while *οὐ* is used 29 times, and its compounds not at all. *Οὐ* has persisted only when it is adherescent, *οὐ γινώσκοντες*, *οὐ δυνηθέντες*, *οὐ δεόντων*, *οὐκ ὄντας*, *οὐκ εἰδότες*, or where there is a strong rhetorical antithesis: *ὡς σώζων ἔπεμψεν*, *ὡς πείθων*, *οὐ βιαζόμενος*; *ἔπεμψεν ὡς καλῶν*, *οὐ διώκων*; *ἔπεμψεν ὡς ἀγαπῶν*, *οὐ κρίνων*.—*βλάβην γὰρ οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν μᾶλλον δὲ κίνδυνον ὑποίσομεν μέγαν* (hardly to be counted)—*εἶδον . . . οὐ μέντοι σκιρτῶντα—ταῦτα, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἔμαντῷ ἐπιτρέψας γράφω . . . ἄλλ' ἐπεὶ . . . ἔγνω . . . οὐ προσεληφότας . . . ἄλλ' . . . συγχωροῦντας*. The interesting thing would be to know whether *μή* is already intruding in this type of sentence also; but that cannot be ascertained readily from Dr. Robison's work.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike. Ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte. By BERNHARD LAUM. Erster Band: *Darstellung*; zweiter Band: *Urkunden*. Leipzig-Berlin, Teubner, 1914. M. 18.

The collecting of the materials and the analyzing of them in detail are obvious necessities in the scientific investigation of any subject. This part of his work Dr. Laum did with meticulous care; and had he turned his notes over to the professors by whom the task was assigned they would have had some reason to be grateful to him. Instead, he has published them. For that scholars ought to be thankful, if they are interested in his subject; and, if the publisher does not lose too much money, and too many librarians and other purchasers are not victimized, everybody ought to be content. The reviewer, however, is not content. The second volume he is willing to commend: it presents the documents, literary and epigraphical, relating to foundations in antiquity, arranged rather mechanically according to the districts from which they come and according to the languages—Greek, Latin, Egyptian, Babylonian—in which they are written. The Egyptian and Babylonian sources are presented in German translations only; the others are accompanied by translations into German. For the collection completeness is claimed, and the claim is attested by the authority of one of the professors. It is not easy for a reviewer to dispute such a contention. Nevertheless, he wonders why no text is included alluding to the many Ptolemaic, Seleucid, Antigonid, and other *Stiftungen* in accordance with which *φιάλαι* were dedicated annually at Delos. But he does not quarrel on that account with the collection as a whole, which may prove quite useful. It is with the first volume that he is dissatisfied. It is entitled *Darstellung* and is described as a *Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte*; but it is in reality an expanded table of contents, contaminated with an index to the materials contained in volume two. Anything less interesting and

more stupid and useless the reviewer has seldom encountered. He advises the reader to begin with the *Historischer Überblick* with which it ends and in which the conclusions of the investigation are stated, so far as this has any. Had the historical review been made into a preface to the documents and the rest of the first volume been suppressed altogether the work as a whole would have been improved.

W. S. FERGUSON

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Ennius und Vergilius, Kriegsbilder aus Roms grosser Zeit. By
EDUARD NORDEN. Teubner, 1915. Pp. 176.

In this book Norden undertakes to rearrange the fragments of the seventh book of Ennius' *Annales* and to prove some new instances of Vergil's dependence upon Ennian episodes. In the former task he is on the whole successful. He makes it appear likely that the *paluda virago* of Ennius (Vahlen, *Inc.*, 521-22) is the same character as *Discordia* (Vahlen, 266), that Ennius omitted the First Punic War out of deference to Naevius, as Cicero says, and that the famous passage on Servilius (Vahlen, 234-51) should be assigned to book viii (here Cichorius contributes the argument). Accordingly, Ennius, book vii, contains an exordium, a brief history of Carthage, a description of Rome's first fleet, the quarrel with Carthage over Sardinia, the Gallic wars of 225-222, and the beginning of the Second Punic War.

Norden's ready optimism as regards his own hypotheses is contagious, but I have not always yielded to the persuasion of his style. For instance, I am not convinced that the line "dum censent terrere minis" (256) must necessarily refer to Gauls simply because these people are said to gesticulate at times. On "Geminæ Belli portæ, sic nomine dicunt" (*Aen.* vii. 607) he affirms: "Wer hat die Jani portæ so benannt? Keiner ausser Ennius!" But *keiner* is a strong word in view of the fact that most of the republican literature has vanished. Again, on p. 143, Norden assumes without question that Ennius was a Roman citizen when he wrote book vii. As a matter of fact, we do not know, but the probabilities are against this view. And on p. 72 an unfounded hypothesis of Soltau's is all too hastily fitted into one of his own. In fact, mere possibilities are too often put forth with a note of unquestioned finality. It was Norden, I think, who first proposed that the katabasis of Aeneas (*Aen.* vi. 232) was copied from some katabasis of Hercules, since, forsooth, Charon's boat sank under the weight of the passenger.

The next chapter, "De Vergilio Ennii imitatore," provides several instances of circuitous reasoning. For instance, Norden chooses some battle scene in Vergil concocted of the usual ingredients of war cries and wounds, gore and groans, then selecting some *disjecta membra* of kindred subject-matter from the Ennian *incerta* and fitting them into a picture of